



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

JUN 21 2005

Brett G. Kappel, Esq.
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP
1828 L Street, Northwest
Eleventh Floor
Washington, DC 20036-5109

RE: MURs 5549 and 5559
Stephen Adams

Dear Mr. Kappel:

The Federal Election Commission ("Commission") recently considered two Matters Under Review ("MURs") involving your client, Stephen Adams. As explained in more detail below, in MUR 5549 the Commission found reason to believe Stephen Adams violated certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act")

The Commission further found no reason to believe Stephen Adams violated the Act concerning other allegations raised in MUR 5549 and the allegations raised in MUR 5559. Each MUR will be addressed separately.

MUR 5549

On October 5, 2004, the Commission notified your client, Stephen Adams, of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Act. A copy of the complaint was forwarded to your client at that time.

Upon further review of the allegations contained in the complaint and information provided by your client, as well as other information ascertained by the Commission in the normal course of carrying out its supervisory responsibilities, the Commission, on May 23, 2005, found that there is reason to believe Stephen Adams violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 434(g)(2)(A) and 441d(a)(3), provisions of the Act. The Factual and Legal Analysis, which formed a basis for the Commission's finding, is attached for your information. Additionally, on May 23, 2005, the Commission found, on the basis of the information in the complaint and information provided by your client, that there is no reason to believe Stephen Adams violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 441a(a)(1)(A) or 441b(a).

29044224508

Mr. Brett G. Kappel
MURs 5549 and 5559
Page 2

You may submit any factual or legal materials that you believe are relevant to the Commission's consideration of this matter. Please submit such materials to the General Counsel's Office within 15 days of receipt of this letter. Where appropriate, statements should be submitted under oath. In the absence of additional information, the Commission may find probable cause to believe that a violation has occurred and proceed with conciliation.

Requests for extensions of time will not be routinely granted. Requests must be made in writing at least five days prior to the due date of the response and specific good cause must be demonstrated. In addition, the Office of the General Counsel ordinarily will not give extensions beyond 20 days.

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. §§ 437g(a)(4)(B) and 437g(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public.

MUR 5559

On October 15, 2004, the Commission notified your client, Stephen Adams, of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Act. On May 23, 2005, the Commission found, on the basis of the information in the complaint, and information provided by your client, that there is no reason to believe Stephen Adams violated 2 U.S.C. § 441a(a)(1)(A) or 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a). Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter.

Documents related to this case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003). A copy of the dispositive General Counsel's Report is enclosed for your information.

29044224509

Mr. Brett G. Kappel
MURs 5549 and 5559
Page 3

If you have any questions, please contact J. Cameron Thurber, the attorney assigned to these matters, at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,



Scott E. Thomas
Chairman

Enclosures
Factual and Legal Analysis (MUR 5549)
General Counsel's Report (MUR 5559)

29044224510

1 **FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**

2 **FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

3
4
5 **RESPONDENT:** Stephen Adams

MURs 5549

6
7 **I. INTRODUCTION**

8 These matters, initiated by the Federal Election Commission ("Commission") pursuant to
9 information ascertained in the normal course of carrying out its supervisory responsibilities and
10 by a complaint filed with the Commission, involve advertising expressly advocating for the re-
11 election of President Bush that appeared on billboards owned or leased by business entities
12 affiliated with Stephen Adams ("Adams"). According to FEC records, Adams filed a report of
13 an independent expenditure on October 28, 2004, reflecting \$1 million in payment for the
14 advertising. According to the complaint, the advertising bore inadequate disclaimers.

15 For the reasons set forth below, the Commission finds reason to believe that Adams failed
16 to file a timely report of his independent expenditure for the advertising, in violation of 2 U.S.C.
17 § 434(g)(2)(A), and failed to include proper disclaimers on his advertising, in violation of 2
18 U.S.C. § 441d(a)(3).

19 **II. FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

20 **A. The Advertisements Contained Inadequate Disclaimers**

21 Between September 7 and November 2, 2004, Stephen Adams sponsored advertisements
22 expressly advocating the reelection of President Bush that began displaying on billboards
23 throughout Michigan, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and South Carolina. Response at 9-10 and
24 Attachments 6, 7; Aff. of Stephen Adams ("Adams Aff."), Nov. 12, 2004, at ¶ 13; Aff. of
25 Randall Romig ("Romig Aff."), Nov. 12, 2004, at ¶¶ 18, 21-2. The advertising consisted of
26 different displays of "catch phrase[s]" such as "Defending Our Nation," "It's About Our National

29044224511

Security,” “A Nation Secure,” “One Nation Under God,” and “Boots Or Flip-Flops?” Response at 4 and Attachment 1 (emphasis in original). These catch phrases “appeared in white type on a blue background immediately above the campaign slogan ‘BushCheney04’ superimposed on the red and white stripes of the American flag.” *Id.* The advertising originally bore a disclaimer that read, “Personal message paid for and sponsored by Stephen Adams.” *Id.* at 13-4.¹

An “independent expenditure” is an expenditure by a person expressly advocating the election or defeat of a clearly identified person that is not made in concert or cooperation with or at the suggestion of the clearly identified candidate, the candidate’s authorized political committee, or their agents, or a political party committee and its agents. 2 U.S.C. § 431(17); *see* 11 C.F.R. § 100.16(a). Adams made an independent expenditure in paying for the advertising campaign.

Disclaimers on communications paid for by independent expenditures must “clearly state the name and permanent street address, telephone number or World Wide Web address of the person who paid for the communication” and that the communication was not authorized by any candidate or committee. 2 U.S.C. § 441d(a)(3); 11 C.F.R. § 109.11. The response concedes that the advertising in question originally did not contain Adams’ permanent street address, telephone number or World Wide Web address and failed to state that the advertisements were not authorized by any candidate or candidate’s committee. Therefore, there is reason to believe that Stephen Adams violated 2 U.S.C. § 441d(a)(3).

¹ According to an affidavit attached to the response, on July 6, 2004, the person who handled the advertising campaign for Adams contacted an attorney whose law firm is general counsel to the billboard industry’s association regarding the need for a disclaimer on the advertising, and the attorney recommended “Personal message Paid for and Sponsored by Stephen Adams;” this information was forwarded via electronic mail to employees responsible for producing the advertisements. Romig Aff. at ¶¶ 11-3; response at 15 and Attachment 9.

After receiving the complaint alleging that the disclaimer was inadequate and contacting experienced FEC counsel who advised that the disclaimers failed to state that the advertising was not authorized by the Bush campaign and failed to contain contact information for Adams, as required by 2 U.S.C. §441(d)(a)(3), Adams states he instructed that “immediate action” be taken to post revised disclaimers “as soon as possible and, if at all possible, before election day.” Romig Aff. at ¶¶ 23-4, 26; Adams Aff. at ¶¶ 14-7. Revised disclaimers stating “Paid for by Stephen Adams and not authorized by any candidate or candidate’s committee. Contact: sadams@adamsoffice.net” were posted “[b]y November 2, 2004,” at a cost to Adams of \$14,545.27. Romig Aff. at ¶ 28, Adams Aff. at ¶ 17; response at 16.²

B. Adams Failed to Timely File the Independent Expenditure Report

“A person . . . that makes or contracts to make independent expenditures aggregating \$10,000 or more at any time up to and including the 20th day before the date of an election shall file a report describing the expenditures within 48 hours.” 2 U.S.C. § 434(g)(2)(A); 11 C.F.R. § 109.10(c). The report must be made either on an FEC Form 5, or by signed statement if the person is not otherwise required to file electronically, and received by the Commission by “11:59 p.m. Eastern Standard/Daylight Time on the second day following the date on which a communication is publicly distributed or otherwise publicly disseminated.” 11 C.F.R. § 109.10(c).

Adams filed an FEC Form 5 disclosing his \$1 million payment as an independent expenditure on October 28, 2004. On November 12, 2004, the Commission’s Reports Analysis

² No additional information regarding the exact date range of when the revised disclaimers were posted was indicated in the response or its attachments, nor did the response nor the attached documents make it clear whether the costs to correct the disclaimers were deducted from the overpayment for the Advertisements or if Adams paid for those costs in addition to the overpayment.

1 Division ("RAD") sent a Request for Additional Information ("RFAI") to Adams, noting among
2 other things, that Adams had failed to file notice of the expenditure for the advertising campaign
3 within forty-eight hours of an expenditure aggregating \$10,000 or more, as required by 2 U.S.C.
4 § 434(g)(2)(A). *See* 11 C.F.R. §§ 100.19(d); 109.10(c). On November 30, 2004, Adams'
5 counsel responded to the RFAI by telephone and stated that Adams was given erroneous advice
6 by previous counsel regarding filing an independent expenditure report and was not aware of the
7 forty-eight hour filing requirement. RAD instructed Adams' counsel to send a detailed written
8 response to the RFAI concerning the expenditure. On December 8, 2004, RAD received
9 correspondence from Adams' counsel addressing other issues in the RFAI, but failing to address
10 the late filing of the independent expenditure report. RAD left a telephone message for Adams'
11 counsel regarding this issue on February 25, 2005, but has received no further communications
12 regarding it.

13 Assuming that the advertising campaign commenced as scheduled on September 7, 2004,
14 *see Romig Aff. at* ¶ 22, Adams was required to file his independent expenditure report such that
15 the Commission received it no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Standard Time on September 9,
16 2004. Thus, Adams' FEC Form 5 filing regarding his \$1 million expenditure on October 28,
17 2004 was more than one-and-a-half months late. Therefore, there is reason to believe that
18 Stephen Adams violated 2 U.S.C. § 434(g)(2)(A).

29044224514



MAY 17 2005
RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
SECRETARIAT

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
999 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

2005 MAY 17 P 3 07

FIRST GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT

SENSITIVE

MUR 5549

DATE COMPLAINT FILED September 28, 2004

DATE OF NOTIFICATION October 5, 2004

DATE ACTIVATED March 3, 2005

EXPIRATION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS
September 7, 2009

COMPLAINANT

Mark Brewer

RESPONDENTS

Stephen Adams
Adams Outdoor Advertising, Inc

RELEVANT STATUTES AND
REGULATIONS

2 U S C § 431(17)
2 U S C § 441b(a)
2 U S C § 441(d)(a)(3)
11 C F R § 100 16(a)

INTERNAL REPORTS CHECKED

Disclosure Reports

FEDERAL AGENCIES CHECKED

None

MUR 5559

DATE COMPLAINT FILED October 8, 2004

DATE OF NOTIFICATION October 15, 2004

DATE ACTIVATED March 3, 2005

EXPIRATION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS
September 7, 2009

COMPLAINANT

Dennis Baylor

RESPONDENTS

Stephen Adams
AOA Holding LLC

29044224515

Adams Outdoor Advertising LP¹
Adams Outdoor Advertising, Inc

**RELEVANT STATUTES AND
REGULATIONS**

2 U S C § 431(17)
2 U S C § 441a(a)(1)(A)
2 U S C § 441b(a)
11 C F R § 100 16(a)

INTERNAL REPORTS CHECKED

Disclosure Reports

FEDERAL AGENCIES CHECKED

None

RAD REFERRAL 05L-11
DATE ACTIVATED March 22, 2005

EXPIRATION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS
September 3, 2009

RESPONDENT

Stephen Adams

**RELEVANT STATUTES AND
REGULATIONS**

2 U S C § 434(g)(2)(A)
11 C F R § 100 19(d)
11 C F R § 100 112
11 C F R § 109 10(c)
11 C F R § 109 10(e)(1)(i)

INTERNAL REPORTS CHECKED

Disclosure Reports

FEDERAL AGENCIES CHECKED

None

I. INTRODUCTION

**RAD Referral 05L-11 and MURs 5549 and 5559 involve advertising expressly
advocating the re-election of President Bush that appeared on billboards owned or leased by**

¹ The complaint used the name of Adams Outdoor Advertising LLP. Minnesota Secretary of State records, however, indicate that Adams Outdoor Advertising LLP is a limited partnership rather than a limited liability company.
(footnote continued on next page)

1 business entities affiliated with Stephen Adams According to FEC records, Adams filed a report
2 of an independent expenditure on October 28, 2004, reflecting \$1 million in payment for the
3 advertising The RAD Referral alleges that this report was not filed timely The MUR
4 complaints allege that Adams did not personally pay for the advertising, but instead directed his
5 affiliated business entities to absorb those costs, in violation of the prohibition on corporate
6 expenditures or contributions The complaint in MUR 5559 further alleges that if Adams did
7 personally pay for the advertising, such payments would have exceeded his individual
8 contribution limit The complaint in MUR 5549 also alleges that the advertising on the
9 billboards had inadequate disclaimers

10 As discussed in more detail below, it appears that Adams made an individual independent
11 expenditure, but failed to timely report it to the Commission It also appears that the advertising
12 originally contained incomplete disclaimers Therefore, this Office recommends the
13 Commission find reason to believe and enter into pre-probable cause conciliation with Adams
14 regarding the reporting and disclaimer issues, and that the Commission find no reason to believe
15 that Adams made an excessive personal contribution or that the other respondents made
16 prohibited corporate contributions

17 **II. FACTS**

18 **A. The Billboards**

19 Between September 7 and November 2, 2004, advertisements expressly advocating the
20 reelection of President Bush appeared on billboards throughout Michigan, Pennsylvania,
21 Wisconsin and South Carolina Response at 9-10 and Attachments 6, 7, Aff of Stephen Adams

partnership, and as such the correct designation should be "LP" rather than "LLP " The correct name of this respondent appears in the case management system

29044224517

1 ("Adams Aff"), Nov 12, 2004, at ¶ 13, Aff of Randall Romig ("Romig Aff"), Nov 12, 2004,
2 at ¶¶ 18, 21-2 The advertising consisted of different displays of "catch phrase[s]" such as
3 "Defending Our Nation," "It's About Our National Security," "A Nation Secure," "One Nation
4 Under God," and "Boots Or Flip-Flops?" Response at 4 and Attachment 1 (emphasis in
5 original) These catch phrases "appeared in white type on a blue background immediately above
6 the campaign slogan 'BushCheney04' superimposed on the red and white stripes of the American
7 flag " *Id* The advertising also originally carried a disclaimer that read, "Personal message paid
8 for and sponsored by Stephen Adams " *Id* at 13-4

9 According to the complaints in MURs 5549 and 5559, the billboards on which the
10 advertising appeared were owned or leased by business entities affiliated with Stephen Adams
11 In his affidavit provided with the response, Adams admits that he owns AOA Holding Company,
12 which in turn has a 76% interest in Adams Outdoor Advertising Limited Partnership, of which
13 Adams Outdoor Advertising, Inc is the managing general partner (collectively "AOA") He also
14 admits that "on or about June 1, 2004," he "hired AOA to design and implement" the multi-state
15 outdoor advertising campaign in issue Adams Aff at ¶ 2²

16 After Adams hired AOA, Randall Romig, AOA's Vice President for Real Estate, who
17 personally handled the advertising campaign, contacted Eric Rubin, an attorney whose law firm
18 is general counsel to the billboard industry's association, for legal advice regarding the proposed
19 advertising In a letter to Romig from Rubin dated June 10, 2004 (Attachment 4 to the response),

² Adams also states in his affidavit that he is Chairman of the Board of Directors of AOA, "but that office is a position of oversight and I am not involved in the day-to-day operations of AOA " Adams Aff at ¶ 3 Adams reportedly has numerous business interests other than AOA *Id* at ¶ 2, *School of Music get \$10 million*, Yale Bulletin & Calendar, Oct 25-Nov 1, 1999, at <http://www.yale.edu/opa/v28.n10/story1.html>, *History of AGI*, <http://www.affinitygroup.com/history1.cfm> SEC filings in 2001 corroborate the information provided by Adams in his affidavit concerning the structure of AOA, and we have located no other public information to the contrary (footnote continued on next page)

1 Rubin stated that pursuant to "Federal Election Laws," Adams would have to be personally
2 responsible for all direct and indirect costs associated with the Advertisements "without offset or
3 reimbursement by [AOA]" to avoid making any corporate contributions, and that such costs
4 should be calculated by AOA at the rate it "would normally charge advertisers for comparable
5 services." Further, the letter stated the advertising effort "must be truly an individual and
6 personal effort by [Adams] in complete isolation from any political organization," and
7 admonished Adams to avoid any communication or coordination with the Bush campaign or its
8 agents, even after the advertising commenced. Romig forwarded the Rubin letter to Adams with
9 an attached memorandum on or about June 19, 2004, Adams received it on or about June 21,
10 2004. Adams Aff. at ¶ 7, response at 6 and Attachment 4. Adams avers that he "strictly
11 followed Mr. Rubin's advice," including "no contact whatsoever with any federal candidate,
12 candidate's authorized committee, or their agents, or any political party or its agents with regard
13 to the advertising campaign." Adams Aff. at ¶¶ 10 and 11. *see also* Romig Aff. at ¶¶ 14, 15
14 (same affirmations).

15 According to Romig's affidavit, on July 6, 2004, he contacted attorney Rubin regarding
16 the need for a disclaimer on the advertising, and Rubin recommended the text "Personal message
17 Paid for and Sponsored by Stephen Adams," Romig forwarded this information via electronic
18 mail to employees responsible for producing the advertisements. Romig Aff. at ¶¶ 11-3, response
19 at 15 and Attachment 9.

20 According to affidavits, Adams gave AOA a budget of \$1 million for the advertising
21 campaign. Adams Aff. at ¶ 4, Romig Aff. at ¶ 17. He received several contracts from AOA.

1 between August 21 and August 27, 2004, which he signed and returned to Romig during the last
2 week of August, 2004³ Adams Aff at ¶ 12, Romig Aff at ¶ 21 A proposal dated July 23,
3 2004, reflected a "grand total" for the advertising campaign of \$977,448 00 Response at
4 Attachment 7, Adams Aff at ¶ 13, Romig Aff at ¶ 22 Adams avers he paid for the campaign
5 entirely from his personal funds, and he decided to overpay by \$22,552, "just to be on the safe
6 side," to make sure no AOA funds were used for any potential cost overruns Adams Aff at
7 ¶ 13, response at 11, Romig Aff at ¶¶ 20, 22 According to the response, "internal AOA
8 documents demonstrate conclusively that AOA charged Mr Adams the normal and usual charge
9 for the services it provided to Mr Adams in connection with the advertising campaign"⁴
10 Response at 12-3, *see also* Romig Aff at ¶¶ 16, 18-21 On September 7, 2004, the first day the
11 advertising was scheduled to commence, Adams wired \$1 million to AOA as payment for the
12 advertising campaign Adams Aff at ¶ 13, Romig Aff at ¶ 22, response at Attachment 8

13 Romig states he received a copy of the complaint in MUR 5549 on October 15, 2004
14 from AOA's registered agent and was "stunned" to read the allegations regarding the inadequate
15 disclaimers Romig Aff at ¶ 23 He immediately contacted Adams' personal attorney, who in
16 turn contacted Adams *Id* at ¶ 24, Adams Aff at ¶ 14, response at 15 "[T]ogether they sought
17 experienced FEC counsel," who informed them that the disclaimers were deficient *Id*

³ Two of what appear to be such contracts from "Adams Outdoor Advertising of Lehigh Valley" were attached to the response as Attachment 6 One is a "Poster Display Contract" and the other is a "Bulletin Display Contract" These contracts were purportedly signed by AOA on August 24, 2004, but do not clearly show Adams' signature or the date he executed them These contracts, apparently provided as examples, were only for advertising in Pennsylvania totaling \$154,200

⁴ No such "internal AOA documents" were attached to the response, but there is no evidence indicating that AOA did not charge Adams the usual and normal rates for the advertising campaign While we do not have any price sheets from AOA, rough calculations and comparisons with average rates listed on www.billboard-ads.com show a general correlation with the rates AOA charged Adams, with some differences that likely are attributable to the individual markets in which the billboards were displayed

29044224520

1 Specifically, they were told that the disclaimers failed to state that the advertising was not
2 authorized by the Bush campaign and that they failed to contain contact information for Adams
3 Romig Aff at ¶ 26, Adams Aff at ¶ 15 Adams states he instructed that "immediate action" be
4 taken to post revised disclaimers "as soon as possible and, if at all possible, before election day"
5 Adams Aff at ¶ 17 Revised disclaimers stating "Paid for by Stephen Adams and not authorized
6 by any candidate or candidate's committee Contact sadams@adamsoffice.net" were posted
7 "[b]y November 2, 2004," at a cost to Adams of \$14,545 27 Romig Aff at ¶ 28, Adams Aff at
8 ¶ 17, response at 16⁵

9 B Reporting

10 Adams filed an FEC Form 5 disclosing his \$1 million payment as an independent
11 expenditure on October 28, 2004 According to the referral from the Commission's Reports
12 Analysis Division ("RAD"), RAD sent a Request for Additional Information ("RFAI") to Adams
13 on November 12, 2004, noting among other things, that Adams had failed to file notice of the
14 expenditure for the advertising campaign within forty-eight hours of an expenditure aggregating
15 \$10,000 or more⁶ 2 U S C § 434(g)(2)(A), 11 C F R §§ 100 19(d), 109 10(c)

16 On November 30, 2004, Adams' counsel responded to the RFAI by telephone and stated
17 that Adams was given erroneous advice by previous counsel regarding filing an independent
18 expenditure report and was not aware of the forty-eight hour filing requirement RAD instructed
19 Adams' counsel to send a detailed written response to the RFAI concerning the expenditure On

⁵ No additional information regarding the exact date range of when the revised disclaimers were posted was indicated in the response or its attachments, nor did the response nor the attached documents make it clear whether the costs to correct the disclaimers were deducted from the overpayment for the Advertisements or if Adams paid for those costs in addition to the overpayment

⁶ As the FEC Form 5 listed Adams' employer and occupation as "self-employed," the RFAI also requested further information regarding Adams' employer and occupation

29044224521

December 8, 2004, RAD received correspondence from Adams' counsel addressing other issues in the RFAI, but failing to address the late filing of the independent expenditure report. RAD left a telephone message for Adams' counsel regarding this issue on February 25, 2005, but has received no further communications regarding it.

III. ANALYSIS

A. There Were No Violations Concerning Corporate Expenditures and Individual Contribution Limits

Based upon the available information, including sworn affidavits from Adams and Romig, and with no information to the contrary, it appears that AOA, acting as a vendor, charged Adams its "usual and normal" rates, *supra* n 4, and that Adams used only his personal funds for the advertising campaign. Documents purporting to show a wire transfer on September 7, 2004 of \$1 million from Adams' bank account to AOA's bank accounts were attached to the response as Attachment 8. As noted previously, Adams claims not only to have personally paid the entire costs of the advertising campaign at the usual and customary rates, but to have deliberately overpaid for it by more than \$20,000 to ensure no AOA funds were used for any potential "unusual indirect costs" or overruns, and "to ensure that AOA did not inadvertently make an in-kind contribution to the Bush-Cheney '04 campaign." Response at 8-13 and Attachment 4, Adams Aff at ¶¶ 7-9, 13, Romig Aff at ¶¶ 7, 16, 20-22. Because AOA appears to have charged Adams its "usual and normal" charge, it does not appear to have made a corporate expenditure. See 11 C.F.R. § 100.111(e)(1). Accordingly, this Office recommends that the Commission find no reason to believe that Stephen Adams, Adams Outdoor Advertising, Inc., Adams Outdoor Advertising LP, or AOA Holding LLC violated 2 U.S.C.

1 § 441b(a) by making or consenting to prohibited corporate expenditures, and close the file with
2 respect to all of these respondents except Stephen Adams

3 Further, it appears that Adams made an "independent expenditure" in paying for the
4 advertising campaign 2 U S C § 431(17), 11 C F R § 100 16(a) Adams concedes there is no
5 dispute that the advertising expressly advocated the reelection of President Bush Response at 4
6 Both Adams personally, and Romig as the AOA employee principally responsible for
7 implementing the advertising campaign, aver that the advertising campaign was designed and
8 implemented "without any contact whatsoever" with any federal candidate, candidate's
9 authorized committee or its agents, or any political party or its agents Again, we have no
10 information to the contrary As limits on individual campaign contributions do not apply to
11 independent expenditures, this Office recommends that the Commission find no reason to believe
12 that Stephen Adams violated 2 U S C § 441a(a)(1)(A) by making excessive contributions Due
13 to the fact that MUR 5559 alleged only violations of 2 U S C §§ 441a(a)(1)(A) and 441b(a), this
14 Office recommends that the MUR 5559 file be closed

15 B Adams Failed to Timely File the Independent Expenditure Report

16 "A person that makes or contracts to make independent expenditures aggregating
17 \$10,000 or more at any time up to and including the 20th day before the date of an election shall
18 file a report describing the expenditures within 48 hours " 2 U S C § 434(g)(2)(A), 11 C F R
19 § 109 10(c) The report must be made either on an FEC Form 5 or by signed statement if the
20 person is not otherwise required to file electronically, and received by the Commission by "11 59
21 p m Eastern Standard/Daylight Time on the second day following the date on which a
22 communication is publicly distributed or otherwise publicly disseminated " 11 C F R

29044224523

1 § 109 10(c) Assuming that the advertising campaign commenced as scheduled on September 7,
2 2004, *see Romig Aff* at ¶ 22, Adams was required to file his independent expenditure report
3 such that the Commission received it no later than 11 59 p m EST on September 9, 2004 Thus,
4 Adams' FEC Form 5 filing of his \$1 million expenditure on October 28, 2004 was more than
5 one-and-a-half months late Accordingly, this Office recommends this Office recommends that
6 the Commission find reason to believe that Stephen Adams violated 2 U S C § 434(g)(2)(A)

7 **C The Advertisements Contained Inadequate Disclaimers**

8 Disclaimers on communications paid for by independent expenditures are required and
9 must "clearly state the name and permanent street address, telephone number or World Wide
10 Web address of the person who paid for the communication" and that the communication was
11 not authorized by any candidate or committee 2 U S C § 441d(a)(3), 11 C F R § 109 11 The
12 response concedes that the advertising in question originally did not contain Adams' permanent
13 street address, telephone number or World Wide Web address and did not state that the
14 advertisements were not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee Therefore, this
15 Office recommends that the Commission find reason to believe that Stephen Adams violated
16 2 U S C § 441d(a)(3)

17 **III. DISCUSSION OF CONCILIATION AND CIVIL PENALTY**

18
19
20
21
22

29044224525

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1 Open a MUR with respect to RAD 05L-11, and merge the new MUR into MUR 5549
- 2 Find reason to believe Stephen Adams violated 2 U S C § 434(g)(2)(A)
- 3 Find reason to believe Stephen Adams violated 2 U S C § 441d(a)(3)
- 4 Find no reason to believe Stephen Adams violated 2 U S C § 441a(a)(1)(A) or 2 U S C § 441b(a)
- 5 Find no reason to believe Adams Outdoor Advertising, Inc , Adams Outdoor Advertising, LP, or AOA Holding LLC violated 2 U S C § 441b(a), and close the file as to these respondents
- 6 Close the file in MUR 5559
- 7 Approve the attached Factual and Legal Analysis
- 8
- 9
- 10 Approve the appropriate letters

Lawrence H Norton
General Counsel


Date

BY

Lawrence L. Calvert Jr
Deputy Associate General Counsel
for Enforcement

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17


Susan L. Lebeaux
Assistant General Counsel


J. Cameron Thurber
Attorney

Attachments

- 1
2 Factual and Legal Analysis

29044224527